

TESTIMONY OF GLORIA STEINEM
BEFORE THE NEW DEMOCRATIC COALITION FOREIGN POLICY HEARINGS
SEPTEMBER 14, 1971

IT HAS BEEN CLEAR FOR SEVERAL YEARS NOW THAT MOST AMERICANS DEEPLY REGRET OUR INVOLVEMENT IN INDOCHINA. RECENT POLLS TAKEN BY HARRIS AND OTHERS SHOW A MAJORITY CONVICTION THAT OUR PRESENCE WAS A MISTAKE IN THE FIRST PLACE, THAT IT WAS AND IS IMMORAL, AND THAT WE SHOULD WITHDRAW ALL TROOPS BY THE END OF 1971. THESE FACTS WILL BE IMPRESSIVE TO HISTORY, IF NOT TO THE MAJORITY OF OUR SENATORS AND CONGRESSPEOPLE WHO CONTINUE TO VOTE AGAINST ANY DEFINITE END TO THE WAR.

THE ELECTORATE IS TALKING TO ITS LEADERS, AND THE LEADERS AREN'T LISTENING.

BUT WHAT OPPONENTS OF THE WAR ARE JUST BEGINNING TO EXAMINE IS THE BASIC WRONG-HEADEDNESS OF THE FOREIGN POLICY THAT LED TO INDOCHINA, AND WILL LEAD TO SMALLER AND LARGER TRAGEDIES IF IT IS NOT RADICALLY CHANGED. WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE CAUSES OF THAT LARGER WRONG-HEADEDNESS IF WE ARE EVER TO CHANGE WHAT THE UNITED STATES HAS BECOME: THE MOST DESTRUCTIVE OF THE WORLD'S GREAT NATIONS.

SO I ASK YOU TODAY TO CONSIDER THE PHENOMENON MANY SOCIAL CRITICS AND ANTHROPOLOGISTS BELIEVE IS FUNDAMENTAL TO OUR DESTRUCTIVENESS, DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL. THAT PHENOMENON IS THE SYSTEM OF VALUES AND BEHAVIOR KNOWN AS THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE.

-2-

I UNDERSTAND THE DIFFICULTY OF WHAT I ASK. DISCUSSION OF THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE HAS BEEN SO TOTALLY ABSENT FROM SCHOLARLY ANALYSES OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY THAT IT MAY AT FIRST SEEM ILLEGITIMATE. MORE DIFFICULT STILL, THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE MAY BE SO MUCH A PART OF OUR THINKING THAT IT CANNOT BE SEPARATED OUT. THERE SIMPLY SEEMS TO BE NO ALTERNATE WAY.

BUT I SUGGEST TO YOU THAT THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE, THAT THE CHOICE IS UPON US, AND THAT NO FUTURE DISCUSSION OF FOREIGN POLICY CAN BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY UNLESS IT OUTLINES THAT CHOICE BETWEEN HUMAN AND MASCULINE VALUES.

AT THE MOMENT, HOWEVER, THIS THESIS IS FAR FROM BEING PART OF THE POPULAR WISDOM. SO I HOPE YOU WILL FORGIVE ME IF I TAKE A MOMENT TO PUT IT IN PERSPECTIVE -

IT HAS BEEN CULTURALLY ASSUMED THAT MEN ARE BY NATURE MORE AGGRESSIVE AND MORE VIOLENT THAN WOMEN, AND ARE THEREFORE BETTER SUITED TO POLITICS. THIS ASSUMPTION OF MAN'S NATURE WAS BASED ON NO EVIDENCE AT ALL IN THE BEGINNING - ONLY ON AN OBSERVATION OF THE STATUS QUO, WHICH, OF COURSE, WAS THOUGHT TO BE SACRED.

LATER, SCIENTISTS DISCOVERED SOME ISOLATED FACTS THEY THOUGHT JUSTIFIED THIS STATUS QUO, AND THE SOCIALLY IMPOTENT POSITION OF WOMEN. THE MOST PROVABLE OF THEM HAD TO DO WITH HORMONES. WHEN GIVEN LARGE DOSES OF THE MALE HORMONE, INDIVIDUALS TENDED TO BECOME MORE AGGRESSIVE OR IRRITABLE. WHEN GIVEN THE FEMALE HORMONE, THEY BECAME MORE CALM.

-3-

THUS, MEN AND WOMEN, THE LEADERS AND THE LED, WERE SAID TO BE LOCKED INTO THEIR ROLES BY NATURE.

IN FACT, IF HORMONES REALLY WERE THE CHIEF DICTATORS OF BEHAVIOR, WOMEN COULD NOW TURN THAT BIT OF SCIENCE TO OUR OWN ADVANTAGE. IN THE ATOMIC ERA, AFTER ALL, IT WOULD BE EQUALLY LOGICAL TO INSIST ON WOMEN AS CHIEFS-OF-STATE PRECISELY BECAUSE WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE INNATELY MORE CALM, LESS AGGRESSIVE.

LAST WEEK, WHEN DR. KENNETH CLARK, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, STIRRED UP A JOURNALISTIC STORM BY PROPOSING THAT "ALL POWER-CONTROLLING LEADERS" BE OBLIGED TO TAKE A CHEMICAL PACIFIER, A KIND OF PEACE PILL, I CONFESS TO BEING TEMPTED BY FEMALE CHAUVINISM. PERHAPS OUR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT - ESPECIALLY OUR VICE PRESIDENT - COULD BENEFIT FROM INJECTIONS OF FEMALE HORMONES.

BUT WOMEN ARE NOT TRYING TO PROVE THE INNATE SUPERIORITY OF ONE SEX TO ANOTHER. THAT WOULD ONLY BE REPEATING A MASCULINE MISTAKE.

THE TRUTH IS THAT HORMONAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES IS MUCH LESS GREAT THAN OUR SIMILARITIES AS HUMAN BEINGS. A RECENT STUDY BY THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION COULD FIND NO MARKED DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN IN INTELLECTUAL OR EMOTIONAL CAPACITY. MORE SURPRISING, THE STUDY FOUND THAT THE MUCH-TOUTED DIFFERENCE IN PHYSICAL STRENGTH WAS MARGINAL AND TRANSITORY; THAT IT WAS EVIDENT DURING CHILD-BEARING YEARS, BUT TENDED TO DISAPPEAR THEREAFTER.

THE FORCES LOCKING US INTO SO-CALLED MASCULINE AND FEMININE ROLES TURN OUT TO BE CULTURAL, NOT BIOLOGICAL. THE BRAIN-WASHING COMES FROM ALL SIDES - PARENTS, PEER GROUPS, ART, EDUCATION, TELEVISION - AND IT IS VERY EFFECTIVE. SO MUCH SO THAT A BOY AND A GIRL MAY LIVE IN ALMOST-SEPARATE CULTURES, THOUGH THEY GO TO THE SAME SCHOOL AND EVEN COME FROM THE SAME FAMILY.

ACCORDING TO THE CALIFORNIA GENDER IDENTITY CENTER, FOR INSTANCE, IT IS EASIER TO SURGICALLY CHANGE THE SEX OF A YOUNG MALE WRONGLY BROUGHT UP AS A FEMALE, THAN IT IS TO CHANGE HIS CULTURAL CONDITIONING.

THE FIRST TRAGEDY OF THIS ROLE-PLAYING IS PERSONAL. MEN ARE MADE TO FEEL THEY MUST "EARN" THEIR MANHOOD BY SUPPRESSING EMOTION, PERPETUATING THEIR SUPERIORITY OVER WOMEN (AND, IN RACIST SOCIETIES, OVER NON-WHITE MEN AS WELL), AND IMPOSING THEIR WILL ON OTHERS, WHETHER BY VIOLENCE OR BY ECONOMIC MEANS.

WOMEN ARE MADE TO FEEL THEY MUST "EARN" THEIR FEMININITY BY SUPPRESSING THEIR INTELLECT, ACCEPTING THEIR SECONDCLASS POSITION, AND RESTRICTING ALL NORMAL AMBITIONS TO THE DOMINATION OF THEIR CHILDREN - SO THE CYCLE OF CONDITIONING CAN START ALL OVER AGAIN.

THE SECOND TRAGEDY IS POLITICAL. THAT HALF OF THE POPULATION NOT BRAINWASHED INTO AGGRESSIVENESS IS KEPT OUT OF THE POLITICAL PROCESS, AND EXPECTED TO THROW AWAY SOCIALLY-VALUABLE TALENTS BESIDES. THE OTHER HALF IS LEFT WITH THE COMPULSION TO PROVE MANHOOD, AND NO MORE WILDERNESS FRONTIERS OR NATURAL

ENEMIES TO PROVE IT ON.

THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT WE PAY A PRICE IN DOMESTIC POLICY. THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE NOTED THAT THIS COUNTRY "IS THE CLEAR LEADER AMONG MODERN, STABLE, DEMOCRATIC NATIONS IN ITS RATES OF HOMICIDE, ASSAULT, RAPE, AND ROBBERY, AND AT LEAST AMONG THE HIGHEST IN INCIDENCE OF GROUP VIOLENCE AND ASSASSINATION."

WHY? WELL, THE COMMISSION ADDS THAT MOST OF THESE VIOLENT CRIMES ARE COMMITTED BY MEN BETWEEN THE AGES OF 15 AND 24. "PROVING MASCULINITY," THE REPORT EXPLAINS, "MAY REQUIRE FREQUENT REHEARSAL OF TOUGHNESS, THE EXPLOITATION OF WOMEN, AND QUICK, AGGRESSIVE RESPONSES."

FOR AMERICAN LEADERS, HOWEVER, DOMESTIC PROBLEMS HAVE TRADITIONALLY BEEN LESS OF A PROVING GROUND FOR MASCULINITY THAN HAVE FOREIGN RELATIONS. TRUE, THERE IS THE CONSTANT MASCULINE MYSTIQUE PRESSURE TO BE TOUGH ON LAW-BREAKERS AND YOUTHFUL DEMONSTRATORS, TO "SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL POLICE" AND PUSH FOR LAW AND ORDER. BUT DOMESTIC AFFAIRS ARE CHARACTERIZED BY A SHORT-TERM POLITICAL FEEDBACK WHICH TENDS TO RESTRAIN THE TRANSFORMATION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL NEEDS INTO POLICY.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, ON THE OTHER HAND, ARE CHARACTERIZED BY LITTLE FEEDBACK, AND A GREATLY INCREASED OPPORTUNITY TO PORTRAY THE ADVERSARY AS DIFFERENT, AND THEREFORE EVIL; LESS THAN HUMAN.

MOREOVER, A LEADER AFFLICTED BY THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE NEED NEVER CONFRONT THE HUMAN COST TO ANY OF HIS VICTIMS - AS HE OCCASIONALLY MUST IF THOSE VICTIMS ARE AMERICAN MI-

-6-

NORITIES, OR STUDENTS, OR UNEMPLOYED.

SINCE WORLD WAR II AND THE SANCTIFYING OF OUR OVERSEAS INTERVENTIONS, FOREIGN POLICY HAS PROVIDED THE IDEAL ARENA FOR POLITICIANS AND INTELLECTUALS WHO FEEL THE CULTURAL NEED TO PLAY TOUGH. THOSE FEW WHO BUCK THE MASCULINE ETHIC FARE POORLY.

POLITICAL REPORTER RICHARD BARNET PROVIDES THIS INSIDE VIEW OF POLICY-MAKING:

"ONE OF THE FIRST LESSONS A NATIONAL SECURITY MANAGER LEARNS AFTER A DAY IN THE BUREAUCRATIC CLIMATE OF THE PENTAGON, STATE DEPARTMENT, WHITE HOUSE, OR CIA IS THAT TOUGHNESS IS THE MOST HIGHLY-PRIZED VIRTUE. SOME OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY MANAGERS OF THE KENNEDY-JOHNSON ERA...TALK ABOUT THE 'HAIRY-CHEST SYNDROME.' THE MAN WHO IS READY TO RECOMMEND USING VIOLENCE AGAINST FOREIGNERS, EVEN WHERE HE IS OVER-RULED, DOES NOT DAMAGE HIS REPUTATION FOR PRUDENCE, SOUNDNESS, OR IMAGINATION, BUT THE MAN WHO RECOMMENDS PUTTING AN ISSUE TO THE UN, SEEKING NEGOTIATIONS, OR - HORROR OF HORRORS - 'DOING NOTHING' QUICKLY BECOMES KNOWN AS 'SOFT'. TO BE 'SOFT' - THAT IS, UNBELLIGERANT, COMPASSIONATE, WILLING TO SETTLE FOR LESS - OR SIMPLY TO BE REPELLED BY MASS HOMICIDE, IS TO BE 'IRRESPONSIBLE.' IT MEANS WALKING OUT OF THE CLUB."

"TO DEMONSTRATE TOUGHNESS, A NATIONAL SECURITY MANAGER MUST ACCEPT THE USE OF VIOLENCE AS ROUTINE...EVEN THE LANGUAGE OF THE BUREAUCRACY - THE DIMINUTIVE 'NUCS' FOR INSTRUMENTS THAT KILL AND MUTILATE... 'SURGICAL STRIKE' FOR CHASING AND MOWING DOWN PEASANTS FROM THE AIR - ARE PART OF THE SOCIALIZATION

-7-

PROCESS...DESIGNED TO ACCUSTOM BANKERS, LAWYERS, AND MILITARY TECHNOCRATS...TO THE IDEA OF KILLING IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST, MUCH AS AT LOWER LEVELS RECRUITS ARE TRAINED TO GRUNT AND SHOUT 'KILL!' AS THEY THRUST THEIR BAYONETS INTO SAWDUST BAGS."

Mr. BARNET'S TERM FOR THIS BEHAVIOR IS "BUREAUCRATIC MACHISMO." EVEN WINNING THE PRESIDENCY DOESN'T SEEM TO PUT AN END TO IT.

BILL MOYERS RECALLS BEING "DEEPLY TROUBLED BY THE PROBLEMS OF EGO AND PRIDE" THAT AFFLICTED THE JOHNSON ERA. "IT WAS AS IF THERE HAD BEEN A TRANSFER OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PRESTIGE TO THE WAR, AND TO OUR FORTUNES THERE," EXPLAINS Mr. MOYERS. "IT WAS ALMOST LIKE A FRONTIER TEST, AS IF HE WERE SAYING, 'BY GOD, I'M NOT GOING TO LET THOSE LITTLE PUNY BROWN PEOPLE PUSH ME AROUND.'"

ASIDE FROM IDENTIFYING ONE'S NOTIONS OF MANHOOD WITH AMERICA'S NATIONHOOD, THERE IS THE ADDITIONAL PROBLEM OF COMPARING MASCULINITY WITH OTHER PRESIDENTS.

~~RETERD~~ AT A NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING WITH McNAMARA AND OTHER EX-KENNEDY MEN, MOYERS RECALLS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FEAR THAT THEY WOULD THINK HIM "LESS OF A MAN" THAN PRESIDENT KENNEDY IF JOHNSON DID NOT CARRY THROUGH WITH VIETNAM. HE EVEN MENTIONED HIS CONCERN THAT THE EX-KENNEDY ADVISORS WOULD CALL UP JOSEPH ALSOP, TELL ALSOP THAT JOHNSON WAS "LESS OF A MAN" THAN KENNEDY, AND THAT WOULD ALSOP WOULD PUBLICIZE THAT.

-8-

EXCESSES OF VIOLENCE DON'T SEEM TO WORRY OUR FOREIGN POLICY MAKERS NEARLY AS MUCH AS PEACEFUL AND THEREFORE UNMANLY BEHAVIOR. IT WAS SENATOR CHARLES GOODELL WHOM VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW ATTACKED FOR BEING A "CHRISTINE JORGENSEN", NOT A KLU KLUX KLAN LEADER, OR EVEN A VIETCONG CHIEF.

"EFFETE,"
^

PRESIDENT NIXON HAS ACCUSED THOSE TO THE LEFT OF OUR VIETNAM POLICY OF BEING "APPEASERS," "COMPROMISERS," OR "BUMS." LT. CALLEY, ON THE OTHER HAND - CONVICTED OF BATTLEFIELD ATROCITIES BY A MILITARY COURT - WAS SPARED SUCH REFLECTIONS ON HIS ^{MASCULINE} CHARACTER, AND TRANSFERRED FROM THE STOCKADE TO THE COMFORT OF HIS OWN APARTMENT BY PRESIDENTIAL COMMAND.

NIXON'S STATEMENTS ARE FULL OF CONCERN THAT THE UNITED STATES MAY BECOME ^{PATIENT} "A HELPLESS GIANT," "A SECOND-RATE POWER": THAT THE COUNTRY MAY BE "DEFEATED" OR "HUMILIATED."

HE SEEMS TO IDENTIFY STRONGLY WITH WAR-TIME LEADERS, PARTICULARLY WINSTON CHURCHILL, AND STATES OFTEN THAT HE DOESN'T WANT TO BE THE PRESIDENT "TO SEE THIS NATION ACCEPT THE FIRST DEFEAT IN ITS PROUD 190-YEAR HISTORY." TWO YEARS AGO IN SAIGON, HE SPOKE OF THE VIETNAM WAR AS "ONE OF AMERICA'S FINEST HOURS."

AFTER THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION IN 1968, NIXON WAS QUOTED AS SAYING THAT HE CHOSE AGNEW AS VICE -PRESIDENT BECAUSE,

-9-

AMONG OTHER THINGS, HE HAD BEEN A "TOUGH GUY" WITH BLACK LEADERS AS GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND. NIXON ALSO ADMIRED HIS "FORCEFULNESS" AND "STRONG-LOOKING CHIN." AT THE SAME TIME, AGNEW WAS NOT LIKELY TO BE "A SUPERSTAR", IN NIXON'S PHRASE, WHO WOULD OUTSHINE HIM AS A MAN.

IN HIS BOOK, SIX CRISES, NIXON DESCRIBES HIS LIFE EXPERIENCE IN BATTLEFIELD OR SPORTS TERMS, SPEAKING OFTEN OF "VICTORY" OR "DEFEAT."

UNFORTUNATELY, FOREIGN AFFAIRS RARELY AFFORD AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A CLEAR VICTORY OR DEFEAT, AS REQUIRED BY THE MASCULINE ETHIC. CERTAINLY, THE WAR IN INDOCHINA DOES NOT.

SO AN OBSESSION WITH WINNING BECOMES AN EVEN GREATER OBSESSION WITH NOT LOSING, IN APPEARANCES, AT LEAST - AN OBSESSION WITH NOT LOSING FACE.

NO SINGLE THEME EMERGES MORE OBVIOUSLY FROM THE PENTAGON PAPERS THAN THIS CONVICTION THAT ANY RETREAT WOULD MEAN UNBEARABLE HUMILIATION. IT IS THE UNDERLYING PREMISE OF NEARLY EVERY DOCUMENT.

JOHN McLAUGHTON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE UNDER McNAMARA, BELIEVES THAT THIS FACE-SAVING WAS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT GOAL OF OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM - MORE THAN KEEPING TERRITORY FROM THE COMMUNISTS, AND MUCH MORE THAN PERMITTING THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE TO ENJOY A BETTER, FREER WAY OF LIFE.

PEACE AT ANY PRICE IS HUMILIATION, BUT VICTORY AT ANY PRICE - EVEN GENOCIDE IN INDOCHINA AND CHAOS AT HOME - IS

-10-

QUITE ALL RIGHT. SO GOES THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE.

IT'S THIS KIND OF THINKING THAT HAS CAUSED US TO CONSISTENTLY OVER-ESTIMATE THE DOMESTIC SACRIFICES RUSSIA WAS WILLING TO MAKE FOR THE ARMS RACE.

IT'S THIS KIND OF THINKING THAT MAKES AN SST CRUCIAL TO OUR PRESTIGE, THOUGH IT MAY BE A DISASTER FROM EVERY OTHER POINT OF VIEW; THAT MAKES US ADD MIRVs TO OUR EXISTING CAPACITY FOR OVERKILL; THAT SEES BEING NUMBER ONE AS AN END IN ITSELF.

IT'S THIS KIND OF THINKING THAT DENIES THE COURAGE IN ADMITTING MISTAKES, IN FORFEITING FALSE POSITIONS, AND SO LOCKS US INTO THE UNNECESSARY, INHUMAN GAMESMANSHIP OF GLOBAL SHOWDOWNS IN THE O.K. CORRAL.

INCREASINGLY, THERE ARE MALE LEADERS, NOT ALL OF THEM YOUNG, WITH THE COURAGE TO QUESTION THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE. SOME OF THEM WORK FOR THE GOVERNMENT - THOUGH THEY ARE NOT FARING VERY WELL, AS WE HAVE SEEN. SOME OF THEM ARE EVEN IN CONGRESS.

BUT WOMEN ARE THE ONLY LARGE GROUP NOT USUALLY CONDITIONED TO BELIEVE THEIR IDENTITY DEPENDS UPON VIOLENCE AND AGGRESSION.

AGAIN, THE DIFFERENCE IS CULTURAL, NOT BIOLOGICAL. NO ONE IS PREACHING THE SUPERIORITY OF WOMEN: IN 50 YEARS OR SO, AFTER THE SEX ROLES HAVE BEEN HUMANIZED, IT MAY TURN OUT THAT MEN AND WOMEN ARE AGGRESSIVE IN SIMILAR DEGREES.

BUT UNTIL THEN, IT WILL BE VITAL TO HAVE WOMEN IN POSITIONS

OF POWER, PARTICULARLY IN THE AREA OF FOREIGN POLICY, AND NOT JUST ONE OR TWO TOKENS, WHO MAY HAVE TO CONFORM IN ORDER TO SURVIVE. ENOUGH OF US SO THAT WE CAN CHALLENGE AND CHANGE "BUREAUCRATIC MACHISMO."

CHALLENGE AND CHANGE FROM WOMEN MAY BE EXACTLY WHAT SOME MEN ARE AFRAID OF, BUT THAT'S THEIR PROBLEM. (I DO NOT BELIEVE, FOR INSTANCE, THAT WOMEN ARE SPARED MILITARY SERVICE BECAUSE MEN WANT TO PROTECT US FROM BEING KILLED. IF THAT WERE TRUE, LAWS WOULD BE REPEALED, SO THAT ^{AMERICAN} WOMEN WOULD NOT BE DYING FROM BUTCHERED ABORTIONS AT ABOUT THE SAME RATE AMERICAN MEN ARE DYING IN INDOCHINA. I BELIEVE MEN ARE AFRAID THAT WOMEN WOULD NOT PLAY THE HIERARCHICAL GAME OF THE ARMY, AND WOULD NOT BE CRUEL ENOUGH. WHICH IS, OF COURSE, EXACTLY WHY WE SHOULD BE THERE.)

THERE ARE OTHER MEN - DANIEL ELLSBERG, FOR INSTANCE - WHO ARE GIVING SPEECHES ABOUT WOMEN'S POLITICAL POWER AS A WAY OF TURNING FOREIGN POLICY AROUND.

"WOMEN DON'T RESPOND TO THE ISSUES OF HUMILIATION, PRESTIGE, AND NUMBER-ONE-ISM SO IMPORTANT TO NIXON'S IMPERIAL POLICY," ELLSBERG EXPLAINS. "POLLS SHOW THAT THEY ARE MORE AGAINST THE WAR BY ANY MEASURE. I BELIEVE THE SEX DIFFERENCES IN POLITICAL OPINION ARE MUCH LARGER THAN WE HAVE BEEN LED TO BELIEVE, AND MUCH MORE INDEPENDENT OF SOCIAL CLASS AND EDUCATION."

ONE MORE POINT FOR THOSE WHO STILL DOUBT THE POTENTIAL DEPTH OF THIS SOCIAL REVOLUTION:

GEOFFREY GORER, AN ANTHROPOLOGIST WHO SET OUT TO STUDY THE

-12-

FEW NON-WARRING TRIBES, DISCOVERED THAT THE LESS MILITARISTIC THE SOCIETY, THE LESS POLARIZED THE SEX ROLES - AND VICE VERSA, AS WE CAN SEE CHURCH-KITCHEN-CHILDREN ROLE OF WOMEN IN HITLER'S GERMANY.

"WHAT SEEMS TO ME THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COMMON TRAITS IN PEACEFUL SOCIETIES," CONCLUDED GORER, "ARE THAT THEY MANIFEST ENORMOUS GUSTO FOR CONCRETE PHYSICAL PLEASURES - EATING, DRINKING, SEX, LAUGHTER - AND THAT THEY MAKE VERY LITTLE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE IDEAL CHARACTER OF MEN AND WOMEN, PARTICULARLY THAT THEY HAVE NO IDEAL OF BRAVE AGGRESSIVE MASCULINITY."

WE MAY SURVIVE THE ATOMIC AGE, AND GET TO HUMANISM YET, BUT ONLY IF WE ARE WILLING TO SERIOUSLY QUESTION THE MASCULINE MYSTIQUE.